

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 16-21 and 27-44 are pending in the present application. Claims 16, 27, 29 and 42 have been amended. No new matter has been added.

Claims 16, 18-20, 27, 28, 42 and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,289,500 to Baxter *et al.* ("Baxter") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,761,499 to Sonderegger ("Sonderegger"). In particular, the office actions suggests, *inter alia*, that while Baxter does not teach an extensible object model that determines whether a requested functionality is inherent in a class object, Sonderegger does teach such an extensible object model.

The office action suggests that column 10, lines 31-38 of Sonderegger teaches "determining whether a requested functionality is inherent (registered in the registry) in the class object (check the registry for availability of the desired COM component)." (*Office Action dated October 27, 2003* at p. 2-3). With all due respect to the contentions in the office action, applicants respectfully disagree.

Sonderegger's teaching of determining whether functionality is "**registered** in the registry" is not commensurate with the present invention's determination of "whether a requested functionality is **inherent** in a class object." Quite simply, the two concepts are wholly distinct. In fact, as noted in the present specification and reflected in its dependent claims (claims 18, 30 and 37) "[i]f the method or property is **not inherent** to the object being referenced, [then] the runtime environment determines if the extension is **registered** in the extension database." (*Specification* – page 12, lines 12-14) (emphasis added). In other words, the present invention itself expressly notes that determining whether a functionality is inherent in a class object is wholly distinct from determining if an extension is registered in the extension database. Therefore, contrary to the contention in the office action, Sonderegger's teaching of determining whether functionality is **registered** in the registry is not commensurate with the present invention's determination of whether functionality is **inherent** in a class object. Moreover, neither Sonderegger nor Baxter teaches or suggests determining whether functionality is inherent in a class object. In fact, the word "inherent" does not even appear in either Sonderegger or Baxter.

In addition, the office action further alleges that at column 10, line 39 through column 11, line 10 Sonderegger teaches "[i]f the requested functionality is not inherent in the class object (the

desired COM component not registered), an extension package is located (query directory services and databases listing unregistered COM/OLE components on component server).” (*Office Action dated October 27, 2003 at p. 2-3*). Again, applicants respectfully disagree with the contention in the office action.

In order to further amplify the distinction of the present invention over Sonderegger, the present invention has been amended to make express that which was implicit; namely, that the extension object is created from an *existing* extension package when a requested functionality is not inherent in the class object. Sonderegger, on the other hand, does not create an extension object from an existing extension package. Instead, as noted in the office action, Sonderegger creates or locates a *new* extension package by searching “beyond a single computer or file system to a surrounding LAN, NetWare Connect Services network, and/or the Internet” or conducting a database search. (*Sonderegger* – column 10, line 59 to column 11, line 5). Therefore, Sonderegger’s method of creating an extension object from a new extension package is distinct from the present invention’s technique of using an existing extension package.

Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 16, 18-20, 27, 28, 42 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Baxter in view of Sonderegger.

Next, claim 34 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,275,979 to Graser *et al.* (“Graser”) in view of Sonderegger. More specifically, the office action alleges that support for the rejection of claim 34 is found in the “discussion of claim 16 for the determining step and a motivation to combine the teachings of Graser / IBM San Francisco framework with Sonderegger.” Accordingly, for the same reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claims 16, 18-20, 27, 28, 42 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Baxter in view of Sonderegger, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Graser in view of Sonderegger.

Next, claims 17, 29-33, 35-41 and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baxter and Graser in view of Sonderegger. For the same reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claims 16, 18-20, 27, 28, 42 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Baxter in view of Sonderegger, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17, 29-33, 35-41 and 44 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over over Baxter and Graser in view of Sonderegger.

DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0510/36349.1
Application No.: 09/240,406
Office Action Dated: October 27, 2003

PATENT

Also, claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baxter in view of Sonderegger “as applied to claim 16” and further in view of Schmidt et al. (“An Object-Oriented Framework for Developing Network Server Daemons”) (“Schmidt”). For the same reasons discussed above with respect to the rejection of claims 16, 18-20, 27, 28, 42 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Baxter in view of Sonderegger, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baxter in view of Sonderegger and Schmidt.


DOCKET NO.: MSFT-0510/36349.1
Application No.: 09/240,406
Office Action Dated: October 27, 2003

PATENT

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application and an early Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested. In the event that the Examiner cannot allow the present application for any reason, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' attorney at (215) 564-8946).

Date: January 5, 2004



Vincent J. Roccia
Registration No. 43,887

Woodcock Washburn LLP
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor
Philadelphia PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439